DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 206 JC 820 457

AUTHOR	McIntyre, Chuck
TITLE	Information System Plan.
INSTITUTION	California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE	16 Sep 82
NOTE	55p.; Report discussed at the meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges Legislative and Administration Committee (Fresno, CA, September 16, 1982).
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	College Planning; *Community Colleges; *Data Collection; Educational Administration; Information Needs; Information Utilization; *Management Information Systems; State School District Relationship; *Statewide Planning; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS	*California

ABSTRACT

Prepared for review and discussion by the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (CCC), this report provides background and recommendations for the refinement, expansion, and increased use of the information system of the CCC Chancellor's Office. Following introductory material proposing an expanded scope of the information system to include integrated data files on students, courses, programs, facilities, finance, staff, instructional profiles, and the community for all of the state's community colleges, the conceptual design of the system is set forth. Potential state and local impacts of the expansion are reviewed, and the relation of this system to other local, state, and federal data systems is explained. The current status of the Chancellor's Office's information system is then assessed, and the degree of voluntary compliance with reporting guidelines by local districts/colleges is examined. Next, components of the plan are outlined, including mandates for data collection and sanctions for non-compliance; applications of the data; implementation of a single integrated student course reporting system; use of the system for planning, policy analysis, and evaluation; requirements for technical and organizational refinements; and budget implications. Appendices include a status report; a plan for the incorporation of comparative data, projections, longitudinal data, and qualitative assessments; a project time-line; and a list of student data elements. (KL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED222206

INFORMATION SYSTEM PLAN

Chuck McIntyre
Director of Analytical Studies
Office of the Chancellor
California Community Colleges

Prepared for discussion by the
Legislative and Administration Committee
Board of Governors of the
California Community Colleges

September 16, 1982
Fresno, California

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

G. Hayward

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

X Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 820 457

Board of Governors of the
California Community Colleges
September 16-17, 1982

Title: Information System Plan

Staff Presentation: Chuck McIntyre
Director of Analytical Studies

Summary

This Plan is presented for initial review and discussion by the Board, after which further work will take place in consultation with both state and local personnel. Following this work, the Board will be asked to conduct a final review for endorsement of the Plan in December 1982. Board endorsement of the Plan will allow staff to proceed to obtain the necessary resources to implement the proposed system.

The Chancellor's Office Information System has evolved, since 1974, into a group of eight files for which data are collected, stored, accessed, and used by electronic data processing techniques. These files contain current and historic cross-section data in unit record form for students, staff, programs, courses, and facilities and more aggregate data on finance, institutions, and communities. Data are processed both at the state's Teale Data Center and in the Chancellor's Office using a Four-Phase System (linked to Teale) with four terminals, a disc storage device, and a printer.

The Information System now needs to be (1) refined, (2) augmented by information for planning and evaluation, and (3) used more intensively for policy analysis, management, and operations. This Plan addresses these new developments and their implementation over the next four years. While developments should enhance policymaking, they are not intended to change either the locus (i.e., state versus local) of policymaking or the specific conduct of policymaking.

The Plan will propose major changes in the collection and use of information. These changes will require adjustments by districts that should, after initial start-up costs, reduce costs over the long term. Changes also will require added on-going expenditures for the Chancellor's Office. Federal funds (through the FIPSE Project) will defray part of the cost for planning and evaluation information. State funds will be proposed to carry out the balance of the Plan.

INFORMATION SYSTEM PLAN

BACKGROUND

The need and basic design for a comprehensive information system within the Chancellor's Office were endorsed by the Board of Governors in 1974. When efforts to secure funding for the original three-year design in 1975-76 were unsuccessful the project was redesigned to span at least five years and project funding secured in 1976-77.

Project design specified that operational, as well as planning and analytical activities of the Chancellor's Office be supported by this information system. Since its inception, project staff have been organized as part of the Analytical Studies Unit within the Chancellor's Office.

SCOPE

The information system will ultimately include integrated data files in eight categories for use in both state and local decision-making. Systems files will contain information on (1) students, (2) courses, (3) programs, (4) facilities, (5) finance, (6) staff, (7) institution profiles, and (8) community. Except for the financial, institution, and community each data file consists of unit records, each unit record containing standard basic data elements relevant to that file. Student data, for example, are submitted in the form of one record for each student at a college containing those characteristics such as age, race, sex, residence, class load, and the like, which pertain to that individual.

The information system is a part of the Chancellor's Office total information environment. When the information system project was initiated, the automated Space Inventory system, developed by Facilties Planning, and other annual reporting systems and ad hoc surveys were already in existence. One major objective of the information system project is to develop automated procedures to coordinate, integrate, replace and/or eliminate as many of these separate reporting procedures as possible. It is recognized, however, that not all information needs of the Chancellor's Office can be satisfied by the information system. The need for ad hoc surveys and some annual reports will continue. As resources and time permit, information system data will be used to replace and/or eliminate as many surveys and reports as possible.

CONCEPTUAL DESIGN AND PHILOSOPHY

Unit record and data element concepts were selected for the system because of their simplicity and flexibility. These two basic concepts provide for multiple use of data, simplify reporting by reducing redundancy and duplication in data collection, stabilize reporting by

reducing annual changes, and make sharing of transportable computer programs a practical reality. The number of data elements maintained for each unit record are held to an absolute minimum.

Data reporting by districts is less burdensome than under past procedures where reports were constructed in their final form at the district level. Changes in data requirements are easier to make on data elements and unit records than on report formats. Reports are generated at the state-level from data elements reported and submitted back to the districts for verification. Chancellor's Office also is assuming responsiblity to develop and maintain computer programs for many required state and federal reports.

Two basic ground-rules have been observed from the beginning of the project. First, no district would be required to fundamentally change its existing information system. Second, to the degree that resources permit, the state-level system is designed to accomodate submission of data on any medium, whether it be hard copy, cards, magnetic tape, or teleprocessing.

STATE/LOCAL IMPACT

As noted, the information system does not require districts to change their systems and allows for submission of data on several types of media. Despite these ground-rules, introduction of the state-level system may require significant one-time local investment and involve changes to the systems of certain districts. The speciifc character of these changes, however, may be determined locally and possible added initial costs should be compensated by later savings.

More complete and valid data together with more efficient data processing capability could result in at least two significant, but compensating, influences on the balance of state and local prerogatives. On the one hand, these conditions provide the basis for a more vigorous state role and greater state-level controls which, if implemented, would reduce local prerogatives. On the other hand, these conditions should reduce the arbitrary element (arising from poor information) in state-level decisions, thereby strengthening local prerogatives. In short, the overall impact upon state and local decision-making is not entirely certain. In any event, care must be taken to ensure that changes in the information system do not cause changes in the character of decision-making. The latter should be determined by other considerations of a policy nature. The information system is simply a tool for decision-making and should not dictate the way in which decisions are made or who makes these decisions.

RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER SYSTEMS

Board policy calls for the Chancellor's Office to provide the focus for gathering data from districts and disseminating these data to other

local, state, and federal agencies. Concentrating data gathering through the Chancellor's Office information system simplifies the numerous data reporting requirements faced by districts. Therefore, it's essential that this system be linked in the appropriate fashion with other federal and state data systems to avoid confusion and duplication of effort.

Other data systems of primary concern are (a) federal reporting requirements, including the Higher Education General Information Survey administered by CPEC; (b) data collected by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) information system; (c) student data for enrollment projections made by the State Department of Finance enrollment projection model, and (d) occupational education, including federal reporting requirements from the 1976 VEA and the supply component of the California Occupational Information System (formerly the California Manpower Management Information System). Continuing efforts identify and implement ways of effectively coordinating the Chancellor's Office system with each of these systems.

The general relationship of the Chancellor's Office information system to district information systems is defined gradually as each file of the state-level system is implemented. Of particular importance, however, are those districts that lack automated and/or general information system capability. The need for uniform statewide reporting may place an unexpected burden upon such districts. These problems are dealt with individually as they occur.

CURRENT STATUS

Mapping 1980 census data to community college districts will complete the development phase for the eight basic data files (Appendix A). Priorities now shift to operations and maintenance, improving the quality of data, achieving 100% reporting, and direct use of data in management, planning, policy analysis, and evaluation activities. The quality of data will naturally improve as each system matures and local districts see demonstrated uses of data that have direct impact upon them. Improving the level of reporting will not occur without some basic changes in the relationship of the Chancellor's Office and local community colleges, however.

The Information System's success to date has been achieved through voluntary compliance with reporting requirements. To the extent that community college personnel perceived some benefits and/or lessening of reporting burdens inherent in the unit record systems, they have actively cooperated in the design and implementation of reporting procedures and have voluntarily complied with reporting requirements. Staff has been very successful in getting all districts to report unit record data. However, there has been less success in getting 100% compliance with reporting requirements. Complete reporting for noncredit students and courses continues to be a problem. A number of districts still do not report unit record data on noncredit students and courses.

As the fiscal impact of Proposition 13 increases for community colleges and current economic conditions continue, state and federal reporting becomes an increasing burden. Local districts are forced to prioritize their resources and there is increasing evidence that nonmandated reporting is assigned a lower priority. It will be very difficult to get local districts to continue to invest in the development of new automated systems for nonmandated reporting. As a result, improvements in noncredit student and course reporting do not appear likely nor is there likely to be the same degree of voluntary cooperation as in the past.

NEXT STEPS (THE PLAN)

MANDATES AND SANCTIONS

Reporting requirements must be directly or indirectly mandated with reasonable sanctions for noncompliance. Continued reliance on voluntary reporting will result in reduced quality of data and level of compliance as fiscal constraints continue to erode district's ability, or willingness, to respond to nonmandated reporting requirements. This will in turn decrease our ability to respond to inquiries from the legislature and control agencies and increase their criticism of our ability to collect required information from our colleges. If this situation is allowed to continue, we can expect gradual loss of administrative authority as state control agencies and the legislature seek compliance to information requests through legislation and/or budget control language.

To mandate data reporting with unrelated fiscal sanctions for noncompliance seems heavy handed and arbitrary. Usefullness of mandated data must be demonstrable and sanctions for noncompliance should be directly related to the act of noncompliance. It would be better to indirectly mandate data reporting through use of reported data in agency operations that provide services or financial support directly to college districts. Withholding service or financial support for noncompliance to reporting would then relate sanctions directly to the data required. For example, student data would be used in the general fund apportionment process and course data in the program/course approval procedures.

APPLICATIONS

To make data reporting more palatable for colleges, we propose that data collected not only provide requested information to the Legislature and CPEC, and meet all required state and federal reporting but also are directly applied to those mandated functions of the Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office that provide a service or provide financial support to local districts.

MANAGEMENT AND OPERATION

One of the primary responsiblities of the Chancellor's Office is the administration of state general fund apportionment and allocation of categorical funds (EOPS, HSPS, VOC. ED.). Separate reporting procedures are currently used to collect data from colleges to support apportionments and allocation procedures. The data required for allocation and apportionment formulas are reported by colleges through information systems data reporting on contact hours and enrollment. These separate reporting procedures could be replaced with a single integrated reporting system.

We are now prepared to take this step. With the passage of recent legislation (AB 1149) requiring changes in attendance accounting, increasing emphasis on accountability, and the issue of state support for instructional activity, it is time proceed with this next phase of the information systems project. We recommend that all of the separate reporting required for general fund apportionment and categorical fund allocations be discontinued and replaced by a single integrated student and course reporting system.

PLANNING, POLICY ANALYSIS, AND EVALUATION

The existing Information System collects cross-section data on programs, students, courses and finance. While these data are useful for policy analysis, the system does not automatically generate the kinds of comparative data, projections, logitudinal data, and qualitative assessments that are needed for planning and evalution. Data are needed to assess student motivation, performance, education progress and outcome. The student and course reporting system proposed above can also be structured to provide information for these purposes. In addition, the joint project of the Chancellor's Office and the Accrediting Commission, supported by the Federal Fund for Improvement of Postsecondary Education (FIPSE), will identify cost-effective ways of securing and using such information. (See Appendix B.)

REFINEMENTS

Effective application of information system data to Chancellor's Office operations will require technical, organizational, policy, and budgetary changes. Several data elements will require refinement, new data elements will be required, and timing of data reporting must be revised to allow computation of attendance and assessment of student intent, progress and performance. Successful integration of information systems data and activities into Chancellor's Office line operations will require careful delineation and agreement of unit responsibilities. Additional staff and operating funds will be necessary to collect, process, and integrate information systems data into Chancellor's Office operations in an

effective and timely manner. Finally, to assure compliance with reporting requirements and reliability of data reported, Title 5 regulations should specify use of information systems data for mandated functions of the Chancellor's Office, and reasonable sanctions for noncompliance must also be instituted that relate directly to reporting requirements.

Technical Changes

Successful application of information systems data to Chancellor's Office line operations will require the following technical changes:

1. Discontinue annual and winter/spring first census week student data reporting. In their place institute term end student data reporting with the following changes;

   a. Require a unique but anonymous record number, to be assigned by the college district, for each student enrolled to permit longitudinal tracking of students through the institution;

   b. Require section identifier, units (if credit class), contact or attendance hours, and completion status for each class in which the student is enrolled; and

   c. Require academic standing, grade point average (GPA), and educational outcome for each student.

2. Remove financial aid data elements from EOPS student data record, implement a separate student financial aid reporting procedure and require financial aid data for all financial aid students.

3. Expand the Student Accountability Model (SAM) to include nonvocational instructional programs, refine and require reporting of student declared educational goal, implement a student program analysis process (modeled after SAM) in the Chancellor's Office, and discontinue vocational educational student data reporting for college districts.

4. Require term end rather than annual reporting of EOPS and Handicapped student data.

5. Add course classification data elements to the Course Activity Measures (CAM) data system.

A summary of these technical changes is shown in Appendix C.

Organizational Changes

Reliance of Chancellor's Office line operations on information systems data will require thoughtful delineation of responsibilities and close coordination of unit priorities and resources. To date, line units and

the information systems project have functioned independently and coordination of activities was not necessary. However, this situation will change dramatically under the new proposed procedures.

Under current practices, line units have direct control over data collection and processing validation since data are reported directly to them from the responsible unit in the local college district. Followup for data errors and noncompliance naturally flow from this process and questions of responsibility and priority are never at issue. However, under the proposed system, this traditional flow of data will be modified at the state level and possibly at the local level. Data will not flow directly from the responsible local unit to a line unit within the Chancellor's Office. The proposed automated system will require that data flow through a third party, in this case data processing, and be processed before data are useable by the line unit. Without careful planning, third party involvement can lead to questions about responsibilities and priorities.

Under the proposed system, only the responsibility for physical receipt and processing of data into a useable format are being transferred to the information system. Administration of reporting requirements and schedules, reporting, compliance, verification of reported data, and followup responsibilities remain with the line unit. Conversely, the information system must guarantee timely processing of data, availability and access to useable information, and technical assistance.

Of equal importance is the provision of adequate staff and resources to provide a level of information service that will guarantee access to information for all agency units. Present staffing and funding is sufficient only for maintenance and operation of data processing systems currently in place. Effective integration of information systems into the management, operation, planning and evaluation functions of the Chancellor's Office will require additional staff and resources to provide service and assistance to line units. EDP equipment will need to be upgraded to allow hands-on access to information systems data and data processing facilities by Chancellor's Office staff. Only by providing service and assistance, and allowing staff hands-on access will data processing be a useful tool.

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS

Fiscal Year 1981-82 Expenditures

Information systems project costs for fiscal year 1981-82 came to a total of $391,200 (see Appendix D). Personnel costs accounted for 55 percent ($215,000) of total cost, and equipment and contracts for EDP computer services the remaining 45 percent ($176,200). Computer costs as a percentage of total costs have been declining due to several reasons. First, computer efficiency is increasing and, therefore, costs are decreasing while personnel costs have been increasing. Second, the information systems staff have adjusted their work schedules and mode of

operation to take maximum advantage of Teale Data Center discounts for off-shift processing. Teale Data Center offers a 50 percent discount for processing in the evening and an 80 percent discount for weekend processing. By scheduling jobs and working evenings and weekends, we realized an estimated savings of $81,500 in 1981-82 (see Appendix E).

Current Year Budget

The current year budget for computer services is 3.8 percent ($14,000) less than last year. Since our workload has not decreased correspondently, operational cost savings must be found or some services discontinued (see Appendix D). All practical means of cost reductions, such as shift workload to evenings and weekends, were implemented last year so the only remaining alternative is to discontinue some services. In determining priorities for information system workload, we believe internal information needs should supersede services provided to other state agencies. We are, therefore, recommending discontinuing a special process for recoding unknown student characteristics for Department of Finance. This will reduce our costs by $7,500.

Future Costs

Augmentation of the information system project budget will be necessary to implement the improvements proposed in this agenda item. Two (2) additional programmers, one (1) data technician and an increase of $53,100 would be required in Fiscal Year 1983-84 and will be discussed with the Board as a part of the 1983-84 budget proposal (see Appendix F). No additional staff will be necessary after Fiscal Year 1983-84 but an increase of $8,500 in Fiscal Year 1984-85 and $17,000 in Fiscal Year 1985-86 will be required for computer services.

APPENDIX A

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
INFORMATION SYSTEM FILES
STATUS OF REPORTING

AUGUST 31,1982

DATA FILES	STATUS	DISTRICTS REPORTING					
		1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	1980-81	1981-82
1. STUDENT DATA							
.FIRST CENSUS ENROLLMENT	OPER		59	64	67	67	70
.VOCATIONAL STUDENT ENROLLMENT	OPER				16	32	
.EOPS STUDENTS	OPER			56	61	65	
.HANDICAPPED STUDENTS	PILOT						
2. STAFF DATA	1ST YR						69
3. PROGRAM INVENTORY	OPER		70	70	70	70	70
4. COURSE DATA							
.COURSE ACTIVITY MEASURES	OPER	26	46	65	66	67	68
.NONCREDIT INVENTORY	OPER						
.INDEPENDENT STUDIES INVENTORY	OPER						
5. FACILITIES DATA							
.SPACE INVENTORY	OPER	70	70	70	70	70	70
.OFF-CAMPUS FACILITIES	STUDY						
6. FINANCIAL DATA							
.APPORTIONMENT DATA	OPER	70	70	70	70	70	70
.INCOME AND EXPENDITURE	OPER			70	70	70	70
.EXPENDITURES BY ACTIVITY	OPER				70	70	70
7. COMMUNITY DATA							
.1980 CENSUS DATA	DEVELOP						
8. DISTRICT/COLLEGE PROFILES							
.STUDENTS	OPER				67	67	65
.COURSES	DEVELOP						
.STAFF	1ST YR						69
9. LEGAL CODES AND POLICY							
.STATE EDUCATION CODE	DISCONTINUED						
.ADMINISTRATIVE CODE, TITLE 5	DISCONTINUED						
.BOARD POLICY	DISCONTINUED						

APPENDIX B

IMPROVING COMMUNITY COLLEGE EVALUATION AND PLANNING
A FIPSE PROJECT
COMPLETION OF STATEWIDE INFORMATION SYSTEM

GENERAL

As part of the FIPSE project, a planning and evaluation component is to be designed, developed, and added to the existing Chancellor's Office Information System. This new information component will serve a variety of purposes and users at both the state and local levels.

The existing Information System collects cross-section data on programs, students, courses and finance. While these data are useful for policy analysis, the system does not automatically generate the kinds of comparative data, projections, longitudinal data, and qualitative assessments that are needed for planning and evaluation. This part of the FIPSE Project will identify cost-effective ways of developing such information for use by local colleges, the Accrediting Commission, and the state Chancellor's Office. An information subsystem and three specific sets of information are to be produced.

The first information set includes those data (primarily quantitative) that currently are gathered and reported to the state by the colleges and districts. These data, in their detailed form, may be used for comparative analyses in institutional self-study and accreditation review. These same data, in more aggregate form, can be used by the state Office in its planning and evaluation work.

A second information set are those data that can be produced and gathered by the college but currently are not reported to the state. These data would serve the same purposes as those in the first set, but would, in many cases, be qualitative, rather than quantitative.

The third information set are those data gathered and constructed largely external to the college: planning projections, community data (needs assessments, census data, etc.), and longitudinal studies.

Coordinated development of dual purpose information should result in significant cost savings to colleges. New analytical models should significantly improve planning and evaluation capabilities particularly for areas like comparative analysis and evaluation of statewide priorities.

To date, six specific FIPSE Information efforts have been identified and work is underway on each. These efforts, described below, are

(1) learner outcomes,
(2) comparative data,
(3) projected needs and programs,
(4) statewide priorities,
(5) census data, and
(6) other data sources.

LEARNER OUTCOMES

Initial work on the FIPSE project reveals a dearth of specific, useable information on learner outcomes that can be applied to community college planning and evaluation.

In concept, the output or outcomes from community college education can be categorized as current private and public consumption benefits together with long-term private and public investment benefits. These categories, often expressed in terms of additional lifetime earnings and certain societal or collective benefits, are the results of value added to human capital (students) by community college instruction and related "support" services. This added value can be assessed during the student's enrollment by measuring the change (from initial enrollment to completion) in both cognitive and affective attributes of the student.

These internal measures of impact, however, are incomplete. It is also necessary to see if the added value has the impact on the individual and society that is expected. A complete assessment of learner outcomes requires followup study of the effects of education after learners have completed their work. For instance, a community college may be quite good (technically or internally efficient) at preparing paraprofessional medical workers, but not economically efficient because few of the program's graduates find employment. Analogies can be drawn for other community college functions; i.e., transfer, developmental and community education.

Faced with the need for both internal and external measures, researchers often advocate longitudinal studies where students are individually tracked over long periods. A number of such studies have been successfully completed. However, these studies are costly and the results have not always been timely for either policymaking or planning. Results are seldom used to evaluate different

instructional strategies or to evaluate the results of similar programs at different institutions. Degree achievement is often the major performance measure. The multitude of objectives sought by community college students requires a more complex set of performance measures.

To address these practical problems and the gaps in both internal and external measures, we propose to explore

(a) adding partial longitudinal capability to our existing student data file (Chancellor's Office Information System) by (1) shifting to term-end, rather than 4th week census and annual, reporting and (2) using a unique identifier for each individual student while enrolled; and

(b) the use of cross-section community surveys which assess in retrospect, the subsequent value of community college education for those who have (haven't) attended a college.

These two approaches, taken together, should be far less costly than a complete longitudinal study.

Approach (a) will require resolution of record privacy problems by the state Chancellor's Office, an additional annual cost of $20,000 for data processing for the Office, and some one-time start-up costs for community college districts. After the start-up, this approach should be less costly for districts over the long-term than would certain existing annual student data reporting procedures being tested by the Chancellor's Office.

Approach (a) will be funded from existing state and local resources. We propose to fund approach (b) from the FIPSE project by redirecting and augmenting funds in the project budget according to the attached schedule.

Approach (b) will involve four related activities:

ACTIVITY	TIMING
STATE OF THE ART PAPER	
This paper will assess the literature and existing efforts (such as the Kellogg-NCHEMS project) on those survey techniques, questions, and strategies most applicable to the measurement of community college learner outcomes. The product is a discussion paper to serve as background for a symposium (see below) and subsequent efforts.	June, July, August, 1982
SYMPOSIUM	
This will be a several-day session in which a small group of leading experts from across the country will discuss survey techniques, questions, and strategies most applicable to measurement of community college learner outcomes. Symposium proceedings will be made available. The ideas generated will be used as the basis for subsequent project efforts in dealing with learner outcomes.	November, 1982
DESIGN INSTRUMENT	
This effott involves the development of survey questions designed to identify and measure the outcomes of community college education. questions will be designed with a variety of survey approaches in mind.	February, 1983 to December, 1983

ACTIVITY	TIMING
TEST INSTRUMENT	
The above survey instrument will be tested by four community colleges that will be doing their accreditation self-studies during 1983-84. One or more of these tests will utilize community survey techniques developed in a Needs Assessment project completed by the Chancellor's Office in 1980 with the support of Vocational Education Act funds. Evaluation of these tests will facilitate modification of the survey instrument and identification of useful survey techniques for on-going uses by colleges, beginning in 1984.	November, 1983 to July, 1984

Results of the State of the Art paper and the symposium will be disseminated to community college personnel throughout California and Hawaii in a series of workshops during the spring 1983. Results of all four activities will be disseminated in California, Hawaii, and throughout the country during 1984.

LEARNER OUTCOMES
APPROACH (B)
BUDGET/SCHEDULE

BUDGET/ACTIVITY	FIPSE PROJECT FUNDS	
	Redirected	Augmented
1981-82		
State of the Art Paper	$ 3,000	
Plan Symposium	500	
TOTAL, 1981-82	$ 3,500	$ 0
1982-83		
Hold Symposium	$ 5,000	$ 2,000
Begin Design of Instrument	5,000	8,000
TOTAL, 1982-83	$10,000	$10,000
1983-84*		
Complete Instrument		$ 7,000
Test and Evaluate Instrument		20,000
TOTAL, 1983-84	$ 0	$27,000

* Tentative estimates subject to revision in January 1983 Project Continuation Proposal based on results of State of the Art Paper and the Symposium

COMPARATIVE DATA

The existing Chancellor's Office Information System contains extensive cross-section data in unit record form on students, staff, facilities, programs, and courses along with more aggregage data on finance, institutional profiles, and communities (within districts).

These existing cross-section data, along with other information, can be used on a comparative basis for the conduct of studies that emphasize evaluation and planning. Comparative data, on like practices in similar colleges, provide useful indices that assist in accreditation self-studies and other college evaluations. A consultant with local self-study experience will develop an analytical model that identifies the ways in which existing data can be used to assess college performance (as compared to other colleges) with regard to elements of the ten accrediting standards as well as other relevant indices.

Suggested uses in relation to accrediting standards are shown below.

Standard 1 - Goals and Objectives

1. Compare 1980 census demographic and economic data on the college service area with regional and statewide data to identify trends or potential changes and their implications for college planning.
2. Compare district labor market data with regional and statewide information to determine impact on college objectives.
3. Compare enrollment patterns and student demographics with those of colleges which have service areas with similar demographic and economic characteristics to determine the implications for planning.

Standard 2 - Educational Programs

1. Compare numbers of transfer students and their achievements with those of colleges which have similar service areas.
2. Compare data on teaching load by discipline with similar-type colleges, and with regional and statewide load data.
3. Compare student retention rates with other colleges.

4. Compare data on job placements of students from the college vocational programs with other colleges.
5. Compare types of course offerings and enrollment data with similar colleges.

Standard 3 - Institutional Staff

1. Compare staffing patterns with similar colleges, and with regional and statewide patterns.
2. Compare compensation practices with other colleges.
3. Compare staff demographics with other colleges.
4. Compare budget allocations for professional growth activities.

Standard 4 - Student Services

1. Compare counselor to student ratios with other colleges.
2. Compare data on financial aid recipients with those of colleges which have similar population demographics.
3. Compare data on special groups with those of similar colleges to identify potential need for new services.
4. Compare ethnic data on students and staff with other colleges, and with data on the college service area.
5. Compare retention and achievements of EOPS students.

Standard 5 - Community Services

1. Compare data on community attitudes and participation with those of similar colleges.
2. Compare programs, enrollments and charges in community service classes.
3. Compare staffing and budget for community services.

Standard 6 - Learning Resources

1. Compare data on print and nonprint materials and their use.
2. Compare staffing and budget allocations.
3. Compare space allocations for various activities with statewide standards and with allocations in other colleges.

Standard 7 - Physical Resources

1. Compare space allocations for programs and services with state standards and with allocations in other colleges.
2. Compare utility and maintenance costs with similar institutions.
3. Compare budgets for equipment replacement and the purchase of new equipment.

Standard 8 - Financial Resources

1. Compare revenue sources, unit costs for programs and services, and cost trends.
2. Compare operating reserves, including trends.
3. Compare trends in income and expendigures per ADA.

Standards 9 and 10 - Governance and Administration, System Relationships

1. Compare administrative staffing patterns.
2. Compare data on changes in board membership.

PROJECTED NEEDS AND PROGRAMS

A model for use by community colleges in projecting future conditions and the implied need for college programs and services will be designed and developed, using data illustrative of several regions in the state.

This planning model assumes that both societal needs and individual preferences are basic factors in assessing relevant future conditions. Consequently, plans for college development should be oriented to expected future trends in (a) demographics, (b) societal conditions, (c) employment opportunities, (d) community interests, (e) plans of other organizations offering similar education, and (f) resulting levels and patterns of student demand.

Expected future trends in factors (a) through (e) can be projected using a variety of techniques and data sources. Among these sources are the 1980 census, data published by the Employment Development Department (EDD), and statewide data on college-going preferences collected by the Field Research Corporation in 1979. (The Field data were collected in conjunction with a Chancellor's Office Needs Assessment project. This project also produced a Needs Assessment Handbook which can be of use to colleges in determining short-term community preferences.)

Future trends in factor (f), the level and pattern of student demand, are a function of future institutional policies and relative costs as well as the other factors. Historic-causual relationships influencing student demand will be identified for use in developing this phase of the model.

Trends in the six factors will be projected for 1985 and 1990. Next, a panel of community college planners will assess the implications of these projections for future college programs and services in each of several regions of the state. A variety of techniques will be used at this stage of model development, including the Delphi method and other forms of consensus building. From this work, statements of the likely character of need for community college programs and services will be developed for 1985 and 1990 in the several regions selected.

Projections are scheduled for completion by November 1982. The planning panel will be conveniened in January 1983. The results of this effort and the procedures used to obtain these results (the planning model) will be disseminated in California and Hawaii workshops during the Spring 1983 and more widely following that time.

STATEWIDE PRIORITIES

At present, there are a multitude of state-level priorities for community college operations implicit in statute, regulations, and other legislative and executive pronouncements. Aside from rather general Board of Governors' goals, however, there is no one explicit or manageable set of statewide priorities against which community college operations may be evaluated and planned.

This effort would involve, first, the development of a limited number of statewide priorities for California Community Colleges. These priorities should be more specific than the eleven Board of Governors' goals, but not be objectives in the classic sense. That is, priorities should not necessarily be feasible or resource-constrained and, depending upon their specificity, they may not be time-constrained either. An initial set of statewide priorities would be endorsed by the Board after consultation with both state and local authorities.

A second part of this effort involves developing guidelines to be used by colleges in assessing their achievement of priorities. This set of guidelines may be added to the accrediting self-study kit and become a part of the self-study. Colleges undergoing self-study would address these priorities in addition to the accrediting standards. Achievement (or lack thereof) of a statewide priority would not bear upon a college's accreditation. Rather, these 20 (or so) college priority assessments would be aggregated each year without identifying specific colleges. Together with other evidence, this aggregation would be used by the Board of Governors and Chancellor's Office to make a comprehensive evaluation of the statewide achievement of community college priorities. This evaluation forms the basis as well for comprehensive planning by the Board and Chancellor's Office.

Thus, the priorities form a structure by which evaluation can then lead to more, fewer, but in any case modified (more specific, time-constrained, measureable, etc.) priorities. This exercise in reviewing priorities and assessing their feasibility will move colleges and the state Board into a planning mode in which long-term policies can be proposed and debated.

Initial priorities are scheduled for Board of Governors' endorsement by December 1982, following an extensive review by principal policymakers at both state and local levels. This timing would allow those colleges doing accreditation self-studies during 1982-83 to incorporate assessment of the statewide priorities into their work. Accreditation visits to these colleges are scheduled for 1983-84. Under this schedule, a first comprehensive evaluation can be completed in the Spring 1984.

CENSUS DATA

This effort is a two-part determination to determine how 1980 Census data may be used in community college evaluation and planning.

The first part of this effort, already underway, is an analysis of how the 1980 Census questions may be applied to problems such as the evaluation of statewide priorities, comparative analyses by colleges, and projections of student demand. This work also will review the timing and means by which Census data may be obtained. At present, data for age, sex, race and ethnicity, and housing are available. Data on income and other factors, now included in Summary Tape File 3, will not be available until December 1982. Data can be obtained from several storage locations in California depending upon the kind of information sought.

The second part of this effort is to update the needed Census tract:district mapping. Census tracts for 1970 were identified with the community college districts that existed in 1970. Due to revisions in some tracts and some districts, this mapping must be corrected. This work will require about six months of (one FTE) staff time. Once completed, the mapping will facilitate the aggregation of Census data by district or by any other service area relevant to a particular college.

There also is a need to solve problems of Census data suppression in cases of sparsely populated areas. Data for tracts are routinely suppressed in instances where individuals might be identified. This is particularly troublesome for small district and small college attempts to aggregate tract data.

Work on the possible uses of Census data has begun and is scheduled for completion in July 1982. The update of Census tract:district mapping and related activities will begin in August 1982 and be completed by December 1982.

OTHER DATA SOURCES

A variety of other data sources (primarily ad hoc studies) are to be analyzed for their use in community college evaluation and planning.

Among the first sources to be examined are:

(a) the Statewide Longitudinal Survey (SLS) a two-year (Fall 1978 to Spring 1980) longitudinal review of 7,200 students in a stratified sample of 15 colleges, managed by a consortium under VEA funding;

(b) the Student Resources Survey (SRS), a cross-section survey of 1,083 students in a stratified sample of 21 colleges, conducted by the College Board and the Chancellor's Office during December 1978;

(c) the Student Economics and Resources Survey (SEARS), a cross-section sample of 6,100 students drawn from 103 colleges, conducted by the College Board, Chancellor's Office, and Student Aid Commission between January and March, 1980.

Like the Census data, various surveys and other data sources will be reviewed for their use in such activities as assessing statewide priorities, performing comparative analyses for college self-studies, and various projections.

APPENDIX C

- Proposed Reporting Schedule — Page 1
- Phase-In of New Student Reporting System — Page 2
- Required Student Data Elements — Page 6

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
INFORMATION SYSTEMS PROJECT

PROPOSED STUDENT DATA REPORTING SCHEDULE

	SUMMER	FALL	WINTER	SPRING	YEAR-END
1981-82	------	1) CENSUS	1) CENSUS	1) CENSUS	1) ANNUAL 2) VOCATIONAL 2) EOPS
1982-83	------	1) CENSUS	1) CENSUS	1) CENSUS 2) HSPS	1) VOCATIONAL 2) EOPS
1983-84	1) TERM-END PILOT 2) EOPS 3) HSPS 4) CENSUS	1) TERM-END PILOT 2) EOPS 3) HSPS 4) CENSUS	1) TERM-END PILOT 2) EOPS 3) HSPS 4) CENSUS	1) TERM-END PILOT 2) EOPS 3) HSPS 4) CENSUS	1) VOCATIONAL
1984-85	1) TERM-END 2) EOPS 3) HSPS	1) TERM-END 2) EOPS 3) HSPS 4) CENSUS	1) TERM-END 2) EOPS 3) HSPS	1) TERM-END 2) EOPS 3) HSPS	1) FINANCIAL AID (PILOT)
1985-86	1) TERM-END 2) EOPS 3) HSPS	1) TERM-END 2) EOPS 3) HSPS 4) CENSUS	1) TERM-END 2) EOPS 3) HSPS	1) TERM-END 2) EOPS 3) HSPS	1) FINANCIAL AID

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
INFORMATION SYSTEMS PROJECT

PHASE-IN OF NEW STUDENT REPORTING SYSTEMS

LOCAL CHANGE	STATE CHANGE
1981-82	**1981-82**
1) REDUCE SUBSET OF DATA ELEMENTS REQUIRED FOR ANNUAL STUDENT DATA	
2) MAKE OPTIONAL THE REPORTING OF EOPS HOURS (WORK-STUDY, TUTORIAL AND COUNSELING)	
3) REQUIRE STUDENT GOAL IN ANNUAL STUDENT DATA SEGMENT	
	4) DEVELOP HANDICAPPED STUDENT DATA ELEMENT DEFINITIONS
1982-83	**1982-83**
1) REPORT 1981-82 REDUCED SUBSET OF ANNUAL STUDENT DATA WITH 1981-82 VOCATIONAL AND EOPS STUDENT DATA	1) PROCESS 1981-82 ANNUAL, VOCATIONAL AND EOPS STUDENT DATA
2) REPORT 1982-83 CENSUS STUDENT DATA	2) PROCESS 1982-83 CENSUS STUDENT DATA
3) COLLECT 1982-83 VOCATIONAL AND EOPS STUDENT DATA	
4) COLLECT SPRING 1983 HSPS STUDENT DATA	4) DEVELOP VALIDATION AND UPDATE PROGRAMS FOR HSPS STUDENT DATA
5) DISCONTINUE COLLECTION OF ANNUAL STUDENT DATA (BEGINNING WITH 1982-83 STUDENTS)	5) REPLACE ANNUAL STUDENT DATA WITH CENSUS STUDENT DATA FOR TWO YEARS
6) REQUIRE PERMANENT RECORD NUMBERS FOR ALL STUDENTS IN ALL STUDENT DATA	6) DEVELOP CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE POLICY FOR REPORTING PERMANENT RECORD NUMBERS
	7) DEVELOP TERM-END STUDENT DATA SYSTEM SPECIFICATIONS
	8) DEVELOP ANNUAL STUDENT WORKLOAD SPECIFICATIONS
	9) DEVELOP STUDENT PROGRAM ANALYSIS SPECIFICATIONS
	10) REVISE STUDENT GOAL DATA ELEMENT
	11) DISCONTINUE RECODING STUDENT DATA FOR DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
INFORMATION SYSTEMS PROJECT

PHASE-IN OF NEW STUDENT REPORTING SYSTEMS

LOCAL CHANGE		STATE CHANGE	
1983-84		1983-84	
1)	REPORT 1982-83 VOCATIONAL AND EOPS STUDENT DATA	1)	PROCESS 1982-83 VOCATIONAL AND EOPS STUDENT DATA WITH 1982-83 CENSUS STUDENT DATA
2)	REPORT SPRING 1983 HSPS STUDENT DATA DATA	2)	PROCESS SPRING 1983 HSPS STUDENT DATA WITH SPRING 1983 CENSUS STUDENT DATA
3)	REPORT 1983-84 CENSUS STUDENT DATA	3)	PROCESS 1983-84 CENSUS STUDENT DATA
4)	REPORT 1983-84 HSPS STUDENT DATA BY TERM	4)	PROCESS 1983-84 HSPS STUDENT DATA WITH 1983-84 CENSUS STUDENT DATA
5)	REPORT EOPS STUDENT DATA BY TERM	5)	PROCESS 1983-84 EOPS STUDENT DATA WITH 1983-84 CENSUS STUDENT DATA
6)	ADD EOPS SERVICES DATA ELEMENT TO 1983-84 EOPS STUDENT DATA		
7)	COLLECT 1983-84 VOCATIONAL STUDENT DATA		
8)	PILOT TEST 1983-84 TERM-END STUDENT DATA	8)	DEVELOP TERM-END STUDENT DATA VALIDATION PROGRAM
		9)	PROCESS SUMMER 1983 AND FALL 1983 PILOT TEST TERM-END STUDENT DATA
		10)	DEVELOP FINANCIAL AID STUDENT DATA SYSTEM SPECIFICATIONS
		11)	MODIFY HSPS AND EOPS VALIDATION AND UPDATE PROGRAMS TO USE TERM-END STUDENT DATA

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
INFORMATION SYSTEMS PROJECT

PHASE-IN OF NEW STUDENT REPORTING SYSTEMS

LOCAL CHANGE		STATE CHANGE	
1984-85		1984-85	
1)	REPORT WINTER 1984 AND SPRING 1984 PILOT TEST TERM-END STUDENT DATA	1)	PROCESS WINTER 1984 AND SPRING 1984 PILOT TEST TERM-END STUDENT DATA
		2)	ANNUALIZE 1983-84 PILOT TEST TERM-END STUDENT DATA
3)	REPORT 1983-84 VOCATIONAL STUDENT DATA	3)	PROCESS 1983-84 VOCATIONAL STUDENT DATA WITH 1983-84 CENSUS STUDENT DATA
4)	REPORT FALL 1984 CENSUS STUDENT DATA	4)	PROCESS FALL 1984 CENSUS STUDENT DATA
5)	IMPLEMENT 1984-85 TERM-END STUDENT DATA STATEWIDE	5)	PROCESS SUMMER 1984 AND FALL 1984 TERM-END STUDENT DATA
6)	REPORT SUMMER 1984 AND FALL 1984 EOPS AND HSPS STUDENT DATA	6)	PROCESS SUMMER 1984 AND FALL 1984 EOPS AND HSPS STUDENT DATA WITH SUMMER 1984 AND FALL 1984 TERM-END STUDENT DATA
7)	DROP UNITS COMPLETED DATA ELEMENT FROM EOPS AND HSPS STUDENT DATA AND GPA AND ACADEMIC STANDING DATA ELEMENTS FROM EOPS STUDENT DATA	7)	USE ACADEMIC STANDING, UNITS OF CREDIT AND COMPLETION STATUS DATA ELEMENTS IN TERM-END STUDENT DATA
8)	COLLECT REVISED STUDENT GOAL DATA ELEMENT FOR 1984-85 TERM-END STUDENT DATA		
9)	DISCONTINUE COLLECTION OF VOCATIONAL STUDENT DATA		
10)	DISCONTINUE COLLECTION OF WINTER AND SPRING CENSUS STUDENT DATA		
11)	PILOT TEST FINANCIAL AID STUDENT DATA SYSTEM	11)	DEVELOP VALIDATION AND REPORT PROGRAMS FOR FINANCIAL AID STUDENT DATA

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
INFORMATION SYSTEMS PROJECT

PHASE-IN OF NEW STUDENT REPORTING SYSTEMS

LOCAL CHANGE		STATE CHANGE	
1985-86		1985-86	
1)	REPORT WINTER 1985 AND SPRING 1985 TERM-END STUDENT DATA	1)	PROCESS WINTER 1985 AND SPRING 1985 TERM-END STUDENT DATA
		2)	ANNUALIZE 1984-85 TERM-END STUDENT DATA
		3)	USE STUDENT PROGRAM ANALYSIS PROCESS WITH ANNUALIZED 1984-85 TERM-END STUDENT DATA TO GENERATE 1984-85 VEDS REPORTS
4)	REPORT WINTER 1985 AND SPRING 1985 EOPS AND HSPS STUDENT DATA	4)	PROCESS WINTER 1985 AND SPRING 1985 EOPS AND HSPS STUDENT DATA WITH WINTER 1985 AND SPRING 1985 TERM-END STUDENT DATA
		5)	ANNUALIZE 1984-85 EOPS AND HSPS STUDENT DATA
6)	REPORT 1984-85 PILOT TEST FINANCIAL AID STUDENT DATA	6)	PROCESS 1984-85 PILOT TEST FINANCIAL AID STUDENT DATA WITH ANNUALIZED 1984-85 TERM-END STUDENT DATA
7)	REPORT FALL 1985 CENSUS STUDENT DATA	7)	PROCESS FALL 1985 CENSUS STUDENT DATA
8)	REPORT SUMMER 1985 AND FALL 1985 TERM-END STUDENT DATA	8)	PROCESS SUMMER 1985 AND FALL 1985 TERM-END STUDENT DATA
9)	REPORT SUMMER 1985 AND FALL 1985 EOPS AND HSPS STUDENT DATA	9)	PROCESS SUMMER 1985 AND FALL 1985 EOPS AND HSPS STUDENT DATA WITH SUMMER 1985 AND FALL 1985 TERM-END STUDENT DATA
10)	IMPLEMENT FINANCIAL AID STUDENT DATA STATEWIDE		
11)	DROP FINANCIAL AID DATA ELEMENTS FROM 1985-86 EOPS AND HSPS STUDENT DATA		

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
INFORMATION SYSTEMS PROJECT

REQUIRED STUDENT DATA ELEMENTS
1981-82

CENSUS	ANNUAL	TERM-END	EOPS	HSPS	FINANCIAL AID	VOCATIONAL
COLLEGE CODE	COLLEGE CODE		COLLEGE CODE			COLLEGE CODE
REPORT PERIOD	REPORT PERIOD		REPORT PERIOD			REPORT PERIOD
BIRTHDATE	BIRTHDATE		EOPS SEGMENT KEY			VOC. SEGMENT KEY
SEX	SEX	NOT YET	EOPS STATUS	NOT YET	NOT YET	SAM CODE
RACE/ETHNICITY	RACE/ETHNICITY	OPERATIONAL	STANDING, BEGIN.	OPERATIONAL	OPERATIONAL	CHE CODE
CITIZENSHIP	CITIZENSHIP		STANDING, END			SAM COMPLETION
RESIDENCE			UNITS COMPLETED			SAM MAJOR
LAST HIGH SCHOOL			TOTAL FIN. NEED			COOPERATIVE ED.
LAST COLLEGE			EOPS GRANT			ACAD. DISAD. SET.
HIGH SCHOOL ED.			PELL GRANT ELIG.			ECON. DISAD. SET.
ENROLLMENT STATUS	ENROLLMENT STATUS		PELL GRANT			VEA FUNDING DISAD
STUDENT LEVEL	STUDENT LEVEL		SEOG			HANDICAPPED SET.
POS. ATTEND. ENR.			NDSL			LEP SETTING
WSCH			CAL GRANT B			
TPHA			SCHOLARSHIP			
UNITS ATTEMPTED	ANNUAL UNITS ATT.		OTHER FIN. AID			
VETERAN STATUS			EOPS WORK-STUDY $			
			NON-EOPS W-S $			
			GPA FOR YEAR			
			CUMULATIVE GPA			

CHANGES FROM 1980-81 REPORTING:

1) REPORT REDUCED SUBSET OF ANNUAL STUDENT DATA

2) REPORT STUDENT GOAL DATA ELEMENT IN ANNUAL STUDENT DATA

3) WORK-STUDY HOURS, COUNSELING HOURS AND TUTORIAL HOURS ARE OPTIONAL IN EOPS STUDENT DATA

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
INFORMATION SYSTEMS PROJECT

REQUIRED STUDENT DATA ELEMENTS
1982-83

CENSUS	ANNUAL	TERM-END	EOPS	HSPS	FINANCIAL AID	VOCATIONAL
COLLEGE CODE REPORT PERIOD RECORD NUMBER BIRTHDATE SEX RACE/ETHNICITY CITIZENSHIP RESIDENCE LAST HIGH SCHOOL LAST COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL ED. ENROLLMENT STATUS STUDENT LEVEL STUDENT GOAL POS. ATTEND. ENR. WSCH TPHA UNITS ATTEMPTED VETERAN STATUS	DISCONTINUED	NOT YET OPERATIONAL	COLLEGE CODE REPORT PERIOD RECORD NUMBER EOPS SEGMENT KEY EOPS STATUS STANDING, BEGIN. STANDING, END UNITS COMPLETED TOTAL FIN. NEED EOPS GRANT PELL GRANT ELIG. PELL GRANT SEOG NDSL CAL GRANT B SCHOLARSHIP OTHER FIN. AID EOPS WORK-STUDY $ NON-EOPS W-S $ GPA FOR YEAR CUMULATIVE GPA	COLLEGE CODE REPORT PERIOD RECORD NUMBER HSPS SEGMENT KEY HSPS STATUS REHAB. CLIENT INSTR. SETTING OFF CAMPUS SPEC. DISABIL. & SERV. AGE OF ONSET SERVICES REQUEST. FINANCIAL AID UNITS COMPLETED	NOT YET OPERATIONAL	COLLEGE CODE REPORT PERIOD RECORD NUMBER VOC. SEGMENT KEY SAM CODE CHE CODE SAM COMPLETION SAM MAJOR COOPERATIVE ED. ACAD. DISAD. SET. ECON. DISAD. SET. VEA FUNDING DISAD HANDICAPPED SET. LEP SETTING

CHANGES FROM 1981-82:

1) REQUIRE PERMANENT RECORD NUMBER FOR ALL STUDENTS

2) REQUIRE STUDENT GOAL DATA ELEMENT IN CENSUS STUDENT DATA

3) DISCONTINUE COLLECTING ANNUAL STUDENT DATA

4) REPLACE ANNUAL STUDENT DATA WITH CENSUS STUDENT DATA FOR TWO YEARS

5) IMPLEMENT HSPS STUDENT DATA COLLECTION (SPRING 1983)

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
INFORMATION SYSTEMS PROJECT

REQUIRED STUDENT DATA ELEMENTS
1983-84

CENSUS	ANNUAL	TERM-END PILOT	EOPS	HSPS	FINANCIAL AID	VOCATIONAL
COLLEGE CODE		COLLEGE CODE	COLLEGE CODE	COLLEGE CODE		COLLEGE CODE
REPORT PERIOD		REPORT PERIOD	REPORT PERIOD	REPORT PERIOD		REPORT PERIOD
RECORD NUMBER		RECORD NUMBER	RECORD NUMBER	RECORD NUMBER		RECORD NUMBER
SEX	DISCONTINUED	SEX	EOPS SEGMENT KEY	HSPS SEGMENT KEY	NOT YET	VOC. SEGMENT KEY
RACE/ETHNICITY		RACE/ETHNICITY	EOPS STATUS	HSPS STATUS	OPERATIONAL	SAM CODE
CITIZENSHIP		CITIZENSHIP	STANDING, BEGIN.	HSPS SERVICES		CHE CODE
RESIDENCE		RESIDENCE	STANDING, END	REHAB. CLIENT		SAM COMPLETION
LAST HIGH SCHOOL		LAST HIGH SCHOOL	UNITS COMPLETED	INSTR. SETTING		SAM MAJOR
LAST COLLEGE		LAST COLLEGE	TOTAL FIN. NEED	OFF CAMPUS SPEC.		COOPERATIVE ED.
HIGH SCHOOL ED.		HIGH SCHOOL ED.	EOPS GRANT	DISABIL. & SERV.		ACAD. DISAD. SET.
ENROLLMENT STATUS		ENROLLMENT STATUS	PELL GRANT ELIG.	AGE OF ONSET		ECON. DISAD. SET.
STUDENT LEVEL		STUDENT LEVEL	PELL GRANT	FINANCIAL AID		VEA FUNDING DISAD
STUDENT GOAL		STUDENT GOAL	SEOG	UNITS COMPLETED		HANDICAPPED SET.
POS. ATTEND. ENR.			NDSL			LEP SETTING
WSCH			CAL GRANT B			
TPHA			SCHOLARSHIP			
UNITS ATTEMPTED			OTHER FIN. AID			
VETERAN STATUS		VETERAN STATUS	EOPS WORK-STUDY $			
		STANDING, BEGIN.	NON-EOPS W-S $			
		STANDING, END	GPA FOR YEAR			
		STUDENT SERVICES	CUMULATIVE GPA			
		COURSE ID	EOPS SERVICES			
		SECTION ID				
		COMPLETION STATUS				
		CREDIT/NONCREDIT				
		ADA STATUS				
		CLASS HOURS				
		UNITS OF CREDIT				

CHANGES FROM 1982-83 REPORTING:

1) PILOT TEST TERM-END STUDENT DATA SYSTEM

2) BEGIN COLLECTING AND REPORTING EOPS STUDENT DATA BY TERM

3) ADD EOPS SERVICES DATA ELEMENT TO EOPS STUDENT DATA

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
INFORMATION SYSTEMS PROJECT

REQUIRED STUDENT DATA ELEMENTS
1984-85

CENSUS	ANNUAL	TERM-END	EOPS	HSPS	FIN. AID (PILOT)	VOCATIONAL
COLLEGE CODE REPORT PERIOD RECORD NUMBER BIRTHDATE SEX RACE/ETHNICITY CITIZENSHIP RESIDENCE LAST HIGH SCHOOL LAST COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL ED. ENROLLMENT STATUS STUDENT LEVEL STUDENT GOAL POS. ATTEND. ENR. WSCH TPHA UNITS ATTEMPTED VETERAN STATUS	DISCONTINUED	COLLEGE CODE REPORT PERIOD RECORD NUMBER BIRTHDATE SEX RACE/ETHNICITY CITIZENSHIP RESIDENCE LAST HIGH SCHOOL LAST COLLEGE HIGH SCHOOL ED. ENROLLMENT STATUS STUDENT LEVEL STUDENT GOAL VETERAN STATUS STANDING, BEGIN. STANDING, END STUDENT SERVICES ED. OUTCOME COURSE ID SECTION ID COMPLETION STATUS CREDIT/NONCREDIT ADA STATUS CLASS HOURS UNITS OF CREDIT	COLLEGE CODE REPORT PERIOD RECORD NUMBER EOPS SEGMENT KEY EOPS STATUS TOTAL FIN. NEED EOPS GRANT PELL GRANT ELIG. PELL GRANT SEOG NDSL CAL GRANT B SCHOLARSHIP OTHER FIN. AID EOPS WORK-STUDY $ NON-EOPS W-S $ EOPS SERVICES	COLLEGE CODE REPORT PERIOD RECORD NUMBER HSPS SEGMENT KEY HSPS STATUS HSPS SERVICES REHAB. CLIENT INSTR. SETTING OFF CAMPUS SPEC. DISABIL. & SERV. AGE OF ONSET FINANCIAL AID	COLLEGE CODE REPORT PERIOD RECORD NUMBER FIN. SEGMENT KEY FIN. AID STATUS PELL GRANT ELIG. TOTAL FIN. NEED EOPS GRANT PELL GRANT SEOG NDSL GSL CAL GRANT B SCHOLARSHIP OTHER FIN. AID EOPS WORK-STUDY $ NON-EOPS W-S $ (TENTATIVE LIST)	DISCONTINUED

CHANGES FROM 1983-84 REPORTING:

1) DISCONTINUE COLLECTING VOCATIONAL STUDENT DATA

2) DROP UNITS COMPLETED DATA ELEMENT FROM EOPS AND HSPS STUDENT DATA AND ACADEMIC STANDING AND GPA DATA ELEMENTS FROM EOPS STUDENT DATA

3) ADD EDUCATIONAL OUTCOME DATA ELEMENT TO TERM-END STUDENT DATA

4) IMPLEMENT REVISED STUDENT GOAL DATA ELEMENT FOR CENSUS AND TERM-END STUDENT DATA

5) PILOT TEST FINANCIAL AID STUDENT DATA SYSTEM

REQUIRED STUDENT DATA ELEMENTS
1985-86

CENSUS	ANNUAL	TERM-END	EOPS	HSPS	FINANCIAL AID	VOCATIONAL
COLLEGE CODE		COLLEGE CODE	COLLEGE CODE	COLLEGE CODE	COLLEGE CODE	
REPORT PERIOD		REPORT PERIOD	REPORT PERIOD	REPORT PERIOD	REPORT PERIOD	
RECORD NUMBER		RECORD NUMBER	RECORD NUMBER	RECORD NUMBER	RECORD NUMBER	
BIRTHDATE		BIRTHDATE	EOPS SEGMENT KEY	HSPS SEGMENT KEY	FIN. SEGMENT KEY	
SEX	DISCONTINUED	SEX	EOPS STATUS	HSPS STATUS	FIN. AID STATUS	DISCONTINUED
RACE/ETHNICITY		RACE/ETHNICITY	EOPS SERVICES	HSPS SERVICES	PELL GRANT ELIG.	
CITIZENSHIP		CITIZENSHIP		REHAB. CLIENT	TOTAL FIN. NEED	
RESIDENCE		RESIDENCE		INSTR. SETTING	EOPS GRANT	
LAST HIGH SCHOOL		LAST HIGH SCHOOL		OFF CAMPUS SPEC.	PELL GRANT	
LAST COLLEGE		LAST COLLEGE		DISABIL. & SERV.	SEOG	
HIGH SCHOOL ED.		HIGH SCHOOL ED.		AGE OF ONSET	NDSL	
ENROLLMENT STATUS		ENROLLMENT STATUS			GSL	
STUDENT LEVEL		STUDENT LEVEL			CAL GRANT B	
STUDENT GOAL		STUDENT GOAL			SCHOLARSHIP	
POS. ATTEND. ENR.					OTHER FIN. AID	
WSCH					EOPS WORK-STUDY $	
TPHA					NON-EOPS W-S $	
UNITS ATTEMPTED						
VETERAN STATUS		VETERAN STATUS			(TENTATIVE LIST)	
		STANDING, BEGIN.				
		STANDING, END				
		STUDENT SERVICES				
		ED. OUTCOME				
		COURSE ID				
		SECTION ID				
		COMPLETION STATUS				
		CREDIT/NONCREDIT				
		ADA STATUS				
		CLASS HOURS				
		UNITS OF CREDIT				

CHANGES FROM 1984-85 REPORTING:

1) IMPLEMENT FINANCIAL AID STUDENT DATA SYSTEM STATEWIDE

2) DROP FINANCIAL AID DATA ELEMENTS FROM EOPS AND HSPS STUDENT DATA

APPENDIX D

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
INFORMATION SYSTEMS PROJECT
COST PROJECTIONS

AUGUST 31, 1982

	FY 1981-82		FY 1982-83		FY 1983-84		FY 1984-85		FY 1985-86	
EXPENDITURES BY OBJECT										
PERSONNEL	$215,000	55%	$223,000	58%	$274,300	56%	$274,300	55%	$274,300	53%
COMPUTER SERVICES	154,100	39%	139,300	36%	175,400	36%	183,900	37%	200,900	39%
EQUIPMENT	22,100	6%	22,100	6%	39,100	8%	39,100	8%	39,100	8%
TOTAL	$391,200		$384,400		$488,800		$497,300		$514,300	
EXPENDITURES BY ACTIVITY										
OPERATION/MAINTENANCE	$297,800	76%	$315,800	82%	$354,800	73%	$442,000	89%	$478,300	93%
DEVELOPMENT	93,400	24%	68,600	18%	134,000	27%	55,300	11%	36,000	7%
TOTAL	$391,200		$384,400		$488,800		$497,300		$514,300	
ANNUAL GROWTH	5.2%		-1.7%		27%		1.7%		3.4%	
YEAR-TO-YEAR CHANGES										
PERSONNEL			$ 8,000+	(1)	$ 59,000+		-		-	
COMPUTER SERVICES			14,000-		36,000+		$ 8,000+		$ 17,000	
EQUIPMENT			-		17,000+		-		-	
TOTAL			$ 6,800-		$112,400+		$ 8,500+		$ 17,000+	

(1) HALF-TIME DATA TECHNICIAN FUNDED BY FIPSE

APPENDIX E

C H A N C E L L O R ' S O F F I C E
TDC WORKLOAD/EXPENDITURE ANALYSIS
DISTRIBUTION OF JOBS BY SHIFT AND ESTIMATED SAVINGS

AUGUST 31, 1982

UNIT/PROJECT	TOTAL JOBS	PRIME SHIFT	NIGHT SHIFT	WEEK-ENDS	PERCNT DAY	PERCNT NIGHT/ WEEKND	PERCNT NIGHT	PERCNT WEEKND	TOTAL EST. SAVINGS	EST. SAVE NIGHT	EST. SAVE WEEKEND
FACILITIES PLANNING	433	361	52	20	83.37	16.63	12.01	4.62	3,993.66	3,080.18	913.48
FISCAL SERVICES	2,173	2,142	21	10	98.57	1.43	.97	.46	99.22	78.02	21.20
INFORMATION SYSTEM	14,575	7,267	4,241	3,067	49.86	50.14	29.10	21.04	66,350.89	25,218.65	41,132.24
POLICY ANALYSIS	1,638	1,392	134	112	84.98	15.02	8.18	6.84	1,103.54	645.74	457.80
TOTAL	18,819	11,162	4,448	3,209	316.79	83.21	50.25	32.96	71,547.31	29,022.59	42,524.72

ISPROJECT,STAFF

APPENDIX F

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE
CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES
INFORMATION SYSTEMS PROJECT

PERSONNEL COST PROJECTIONS

AUGUST 30, 1982

POSITION	FY 81-82	FY 82-83	FY 83-84	FY 84-85	FY 85-86
DIRECTOR	$ 18,400 (.4)	$ 18,400 (.4)	$ 18,400 (.4)	$ 18,400 (.4)	$ 18,400 (.4)
SPECIALIST	39,000 (1)	39,000 (1)	39,000 (1)	39,000 (1)	39,000 (1)
SENIOR PROGRAMMER/ANALYST	36,200 (1)	36,200 (1)	36,200 (1)	36,200 (1)	36,200 (1)
STAFF PROGRAMMER/ANALYST	33,000 (1)	33,000 (1)	33,000 (1)	33,000 (1)	33,000 (1)
PROGRAMMER *	21,700 (1)	21,700 (1)	65,100 (3)	65,100 (3)	65,100 (3)
DATA TECHNICIAN **	31,800 (2)	39,800 (2.5)	47,700 (3)	47,700 (3)	47,700 (3)
KEY DATA OPERATOR	14,300 (1)	14,300 (1)	14,300 (1)	14,300 (1)	14,300 (1)
RESEARCH ANALYST	13,700 (.5)	13,700 (.5)	13,700 (.5)	13,700 (.5)	13,700 (.5)
OFFICE ASSISTANT	6,900 (.5)	6,900 (.5)	6,900 (.5)	6,900 (.5)	6,900 (.5)
	$215,000 (8.4)	$223,000 (8.9)	$274,300 (11.4)	$274,300 (11.4)	$274,300 (11.4)

* 2 NEW POSITION IN FY 1983-84

** 1/2 POSITION FUNDED BY FIPSE PROJECT IN FY 82-83
1 NEW POSITION IN FY 83-84

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges
96 Powell Library Building
University of California
Los Angeles, California 90024
NOV 19 1982